

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the Official Action mailed October 12, 2005.
Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully considered.

Drawings

It is noted with appreciation that the drawings filed on May 1, 2004 are accepted by the Examiner.

Priority Claim

It is also noted with appreciation that the certified copies of the priority documents have been received by the International Bureau and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 9, 2004 has been considered by the Examiner as noted by the initialed PTO 1449 form.

Rejection of Claims 1 to 11

Claims 1 to 11 were pending in this application as filed. Each of these claims was said in the introductory paragraph of section 4 of the Acton to be rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fasen '673 in view of Watanabe '291. However, no mapping of the rejection of claims 1 to 4 was made. See the claims pending in the first preliminary amendment. It is thus assumed that claims 1 to 4 were rejected substantially for the same reasoning as applied to apparatus claims 5 to 9.

Without acquiescence in or agreement with the statement of the rejection, claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 3 and 4, with claims 3 and 4 being canceled. Similarly, claim 5 is amended to include the subject matter of claims 7 and 8 with claims 7 and 8

canceled. Claims 2 and 6 are retained. Method claim 9 was amended to include the subject matter of now-canceled claim 11, while claim 10 is retained.

Claim 1 was amended in some slight respects to refer to first and second magnetic gaps, for increased clarity of the structure of the claim. It is believed that claim 5 is clear in its reference to a first azimuth angle and a second azimuth angle.

The attention of the examiner is invited to the Background of the Invention at pages 1 to 6 of the application as filed, and to Fig. 8, as well as the cited JP publication in the initial IDS. Main features of the invention are described especially in Fig. 3 and discussed at pages 15 to 18 of the specification as filed. Thus, main features of the invention include the positional relationship between the magnet gaps having different azimuth angles on an inclined track where the heads are mounted on a rotary drum in which each had has a plurality of magnetic gaps. The now-claimed features of the invention are not found in the stated combination of references, even assuming that the combination is proper.

Claims 1, 5 and 9 now refer to a rotary drum and recording on an inclined track. Fasen '673 in contrast describes a multi-gap head for so-called linear tape recording wherein the head is not mounted on a rotary drum. In addition, the head configuration of the head 84 described in Fig. 7 in Fasen '673 is different from the head configuration described in this application and as reflected in varying degrees of scope in the pending, amended claims. Head 84 has a plurality of magnetic gaps having different azimuth angles 105A, 105B, 106A, 106B, 107A, 107B, 108A, and 108B on the same track. Thus, using the head having the head configuration of Fasen would make it impossible to record the recording tracks described in this application resulting from the head system and method as claimed in amended claims 1, 5, and 9.

The head configuration in Watanabe '291 is totally different from the head configuration described in this application. Each head 57, 58 described in Fig. 8 in the Watanabe '291 patent has only a single gap g1 and g2, and these heads are so-called metal in gap block heads having a thin film 63, 77 on the head gap. The heads are made by a machine process.

Moreover, the combination as stated in not motivated or suggested by the cited art

Watanabe refers to a single gap in the heads 57, 58 thus not suggesting plural gaps from Fasen, and Fasen does not relate to inclined track recording with a rotary drum, but rather is directed to a linear tape recording method. As such, the combinations are not suggested, but even if proper, do not result in the claimed invention of claims 1, 5, and 9 as amended.

Claims 2 and 6 are patentable because their base claims 1 and 5 respectively are patentable as noted above, and for their additional features of the overwriting resulting from the positional relationship claimed. See the specific limitations regarding the "center" of each magnetization pattern as stated.

For at least the reasons stated, amended claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 9 remain pending and are allowable over the art applied.

Conclusion

It is submitted that amended claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 are allowable over the art of record. No fee is believed due; however, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. SON-2897, from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: February 3, 2006

Customer No. 23353

Respectfully submitted,

By

Ronald P. Kananen

Registration No.: 24,104

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

1233 20th Street, N.W.

Suite 501

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 955-3750

Attorney for Applicant